/EAVER& THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

500 12th Street, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: (510) 663-1100 Facsimile: (510) 663-0920 www.beyerlaw.com

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION **FACSIMILE** TO THE ATTENTION OF: Examiner Kuo Liang J. Tang **ART UNIT 2122**

FAX NO.: 571-273-3705

Date:

March 28, 2005

Sender:

John F. Griffith

Our Ref. No.: SUN1P802

Application No. 09/841,759

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 3

MESSAGE:

Please see attached. We request a telephone interview on Thursday, March 31, 2005 at 2 pm EST.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

Not Agreed

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	
In re application of: PLUMMER, et al.	Attorney Docket No.: SUN1P802/P5257
Application No.: 09/841,759	Examiner: Tang, Kuo Liang J.
Filed: April 24, 2001	Group: 2122
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REWRITING BYTECODES TO MINIMIZE RUNTIME CHECKS	
CE Ih to	ertificate of facsimile transmission creby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 28, 2005. ened: Dilora Haddad
APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM	
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
Tentative Participants:	
1) John F. Griffith 2) Exam 3) 4)	iner Kuo Liang J. Tang
Proposed Date of Interview: 03/31/05	Proposed Time: 2pm EST.
Type of Interview Requested:	
☐ Telephone ☐ Personal ☐	Video Conference
Exhibit to be Shown or Demonstrated: Ye If yes, provide brief description:	es 🔲 No

Prior Art

Long and Seshadri

Claims/Fig.,

Claim 1 Figure 2

#\$

Issues

USC 103

2)

(Rej., Obj., etc.)
1) Rejection of claims under 35

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

Discussed

Agreed

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AGRUMENTS TO BE PRESENTED:

Applicant agrees that Long shows a preloader in Fig. 9, col. 7:22-33; however, Long teaches rewriting code according to native endianness. Long does not show rewriting a bytecode to a new bytecode which indicates that at least one of the class and the superclass requires execution of the static initializer when it is determined that the bytecode makes the active reference to the class which requires the execution of the static initializer, as recited in claim 1.

*Note: This form should be completed be applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01). This application will not be delay from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFT 1.33(b)) as soon as possible.

John F. Griffith, Reg. No. 44 37

Examiner Kuo Liang J. Tang